

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/509,570

Applicant(s)

TRINKLE ET AL.

Examiner

LAYLA BLAND

Art Unit

1623

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) LAYLA BLAND.

(3) _____.

(2) Paula De Grandis.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 September 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 17 and 18.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hu et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner told Ms. DeGrandis that claim 17 was not allowable because it was very similar to Hu et al. The examiner proposed an examiner's amendment incorporating the limitations of claim 18 into claim 17 and cancelling claim 18. Ms. DeGrandis authorized the proposed examiner's amendment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Layla Bland/
Examiner, Art Unit 1623